EXHIBIT PP

```
Pages 1 - 59
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
    BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE, MAGISTRATE
ORACLE CORPORATION,
              Plaintiff,
  VS:
                                     )NO. C 07-1658
SAP AG, et al,
                                     )San Francisco, California
              Defendants.
                                     ) Tuesday
                                     )August 4, 2009
                                     )2:00 p.m.
                   TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
APPEARANCES:
For Plaintiff:
                         BINGHAM, MCCUTCHEN LLP
                         Three Embarcadero Center
                         San Francisco, California 94111-4067
                    BY:
                         GEOFFREY M. HOWARD, ESQ.
                         JOHN POLITO, ESQ.
                         ZACHARY J. ALINDER, ESQ.
For Defendants:
                         JONES DAY
                         717 Texas
                         Suite 300
                         Houston, Texas 77002
                    BY:
                         SCOTT W. COWAN, ESQ.
                         JONES DAY
                         1755 Embarcadero Road
                         Palo Alto, California 94303
                         JACQUELINE K.S. LEE, ESQ.
                    BY:
                         HEATHER FUGITT, ESQ.
Reported By: Debra L. Pas, CSR 11916, CRR, RMR, RPR
          Official Reporter - US District Court
```

Debra L. Pas, CSR, CRR, RMR, RPR Official Reporter - U.S. District Court - San Francisco, California (415) 431-1477

Computerized Transcription By Eclipse

1 THE COURT: And you're saying that they could go through exactly the same process as you? 2 MR. COWAN: Correct. 3 Have you looked at the instances where THE COURT: 4 5 the customer requested "All" on the request form and had than all of the boxes checked on their authorization? 6 MR. COWAN: Well, and that's -- that question 7 presupposes that the customer filled out the download request 8 They did not. That was a Tomorrow Now completed form 9 form. 10 on Page 2. Well, but it doesn't really matter who THE COURT: 11 filled it out. In other words --You are saying on Page 1? 13 MR. COWAN: How many instances -- I'm just looking THE COURT: 14 at what potentially would be more manageable and 15 straightforward, because you would only need to compare two 16 pieces of paper potentially. 17 MR. COWAN: But they could do that as easy as we 18 could because it's not going to require us referring to any 19 of our witnesses or any evidence that hasn't already been 20 produced in the case. They can do that analysis as easy as 21 The data is there. 22 we can. 23 THE COURT: Has anyone done that analysis? On our end, not that I'm aware of. MR. COWAN: 24 would assume they have either not done it or maybe they have 25